

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of the pending claims based on the amendments to the claims and the remarks presented below. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the following information.

**The Objection to Figure 3 is Improper**

The drawings are objected to because Figure 3 allegedly presents partial views. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Figure 3 depicts a flow diagram of the relationship between components of a report instance according to an embodiment of the present invention. When the description of Figure 3 is read in light of the specification, it is clear that Figure 3 is not a partial view. Thus, the drawing objection to the alleged partial view does not apply. If the Examiner still believes that the objection to Figure 3 is sustainable, the Applicants respectfully request clarification of the objection. Specifically, Applicants request suggested amendments to the drawing that would clarify that it is not a partial view.

**The 35 USC § 101 Rejection of Claims 1-7**

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the reporting system of claim 1 is for report definition and report creation. It has also been amended to clarify the relationship between a resolution object and report creation. As such it clearly presents a concrete tangible result.

The Examiner asserts that claims are not limited to tangible embodiments. However, there is no such limitation on the patentable subject matter as long as the claimed invention as a whole accomplishes a practical application. That is, it must produce a “useful, concrete and tangible result.” State Street Bank & Trust Co. v. Signature Financial Group Inc., 149 F.3d 1368, 1373, 47 USPQ2d 1596, 1601-02. Furthermore, Applicants direct the Examiner to the case law set forth in In re Beauregard, 35 USPQ 2d 1383, 1384 (Fed. Cir. 1995), the recently decided In re Lundgren, (cite pending), and others, which clearly provide a patentable subject matter basis for claim(s).

Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1 and thus the amendment to claim 1 should remove the basis of rejection for the dependent claims.

Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejections of claims 1-7.

**The 35 USC § 112 Rejection of Claims 21-23**

Claim 21 has been amended to cure antecedent basis issues and to remove Examiner's objections to vagueness. It is believed claim 21 is now in a state for allowance. Claims 22-23 were rejected because of their dependency on 21.

Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejections of claims 21-23.

**The 35 USC § 112 Rejection of Claims 1-7**

As discussed above claim 1 has been amended. It is believed that the amendment puts the claim in a state for allowance. Claims 2-7 were rejected because of their dependency on claim 1.

Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejections of claims 1-7.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants submit that the pending claims are now in a state for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw his rejections, allow the pending claims and pass the application to issue.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference or interview would advance prosecution of this application in any manner, the undersigned stands ready to conduct such a conference at the convenience of the Examiner.

If there are any fees due under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 or §1.117 which are not enclosed herewith, including any fees required for extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, please charge such fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0206.

Respectfully submitted,

HUNTON & WILLIAMS

By: 

Yisun Song  
Registration No. 44,487 for  
Brian M. Buroker  
Registration No. 39,125

Date: January 25, 2007  
Hunton & Williams, LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006-1109  
Telephone: (202) 955-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 778-2201